

**Remarks**

**A. Pending Claims**

Claims 1, 5-11, and 15-25 are rejected. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 22 have been amended. Claims 10 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 11, 15-19, and 21-25 are pending.

**B. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Mages Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482 to Ochiai et al. (hereinafter “Ochiai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,228 to Sposato (“Sposato”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,427,238 to Goodman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,329 to Mages et al. (hereinafter “Mages”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 22 include at least some of the features of claims 10 or 20. For example, claim 1 describes a combination of feature including, but not limited to, the features of:

controlling playback operation of the multimedia information in the storage device based on received user operation actions, wherein the received user operations comprise requests to pause, rewind or fast-forward the multimedia information

The Office Action concedes that the combination of Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature of Applicant’s claimed method. Specifically, the Office Action states that “Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman does not disclose that the ‘control information’ contains a program for checking user operations contents and executing the program when user operation is detected and plays back multimedia information corresponding to the user operation contents.” (Office Action, Page 11) The Office

Action relies on Mages to remedy the deficiencies of the cited art. In the Office Action the “parental rating controls” described in Mages are equated with Applicant’s user operations.

Applicant has amended the claims for clarification. The claims include, but are not limited to the feature of “user operations comprise requests to pause, rewind or fast-forward the multimedia information.” Applicant submits that this feature does not appear to be taught or suggested by the combination of Ochiai, Sposato, Goodman and Mages. While Mages appears to teach the use of parental rating controls to allow or inhibit playback of multimedia information, Applicant submits that there is no teaching of the use of commands such as pause, fast-forward or rewind in combination with the other features of Applicant’s claims.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant’s claims are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato, Goodman and Mages.

**C. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482 to Ochiai et al. (hereinafter “Ochiai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,228 to Sposato (“Sposato”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,427,238 to Goodman et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection for at least the same reasons recited in Applicant’s previous response. Applicant has, however, amended the claims for clarification.

Claim 1 describes a combination of feature including, but not limited to, the features of:

controlling playback operation of the multimedia information in the storage device based on received user operation actions, wherein the received user operations comprise requests to pause, rewind or fast-forward the multimedia information

The Office Action concedes that the combination of Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman does not appear to teach or suggest at least this feature of Applicant’s claimed method.

Specifically, the Office Action states that “Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman does not

disclose that the 'control information' contains a program for checking user operations contents and executing the program when user operation is detected and plays back multimedia information corresponding to the user operation contents."

(Office Action, Page 11)

For at least the reasons state above, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman.

**D. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and Goodman and further in view of Kamo Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002-0057694 to Kamo (hereinafter "Kamo"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 5 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato, Goodman, and Kamo.

**E. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and Goodman and further in view of Dan Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,637 to Dan et al. (hereinafter "Dan"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato, Goodman, and Dan.

**F. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Brown Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and Goodman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,179 to Brown et al. ("Brown"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 8 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato, Goodman, and Brown.

**G. Additional Remarks**

Based on the above, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a two-month extension of time to respond to the Office Action dated July 28, 2008. If any further extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5664-00100/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric B. Meyertons  
Reg. No. 34,876  
Attorney for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
(512) 853-8800 (voice)  
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: Dec 2, 2008